



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

cel

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/932,499	08/17/2001	John DiDomenico	87354.2880	6293

30734 7590 08/30/2005

BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP  
WASHINGTON SQUARE, SUITE 1100  
1050 CONNECTICUT AVE. N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20036-5304

EXAMINER
----------

TRIEU, VAN THANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2636

DATE MAILED: 08/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/932,499

Applicant(s)

DIDOMENICO ET AL.

Examiner

Van T. Trieu

Art Unit

2636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/21/02</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

1. Claims 1, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Poland et al** [US 6,681,195].

Regarding claim 1, the claimed a system for managing visual images of vehicles, comprising: a first digital video image collector positioned to capture a first data file that is representative of a visual image of at least one feature of a first vehicle moving on a roadway, the first digital video image collector including a first communications port (the compact speed measurement system 100 includes a digital camera 140 for capturing digital images of traveling vehicle 134 and sending the captured images to a portable computer processor 110 through a communication port 530, see Figs. 1 and 5, col. 3, lines 43-59, col. 5, lines 42-50 and col. 13, lines 16-20); and the computing device having a processor, a memory, and a second communications port (the computer processor 110 includes a CPU 114, a memory 120 and a communication port 502, see Figs. 1 and 5, col. 8, lines 54-65 and col. 13, lines 50-52); and the first communications link between the first communications port and the second communications port (the

Art Unit: 2636

standard cable 'not shown' for connecting between the camera port 530 and the computer processor port 502, see Fig. 5, col. 13, lines 18-24 and 45-52); and the first information collection device in communication with the computer, the first information collection device positioned to capture at least one of speed, acceleration, and emissions data corresponding to the first vehicle (the image capture system 100 is selectively positioned to provide a best capturing images of the vehicles 134, and including a system coordinator 118 is configured to allow an operator of the computer processor 110 to browse previously captured digital images, and to capture new images of vehicles 134 with speed data of each vehicles 134, see Fig. 1, col. 9, lines 5-46).

Regarding claim 11, the claimed means for illumination at least a portion of the first vehicle without distracting the attention of a driver of the vehicle, which reads upon the image capture system 100 having a digital camera 140 to control glare and to better illuminate license plate of target vehicle, see col. 14, lines 1-18.

Regarding claim 12, the method claimed limitations are met by the apparatus claim cited in respect to claim 1 above.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Poland et al** [US 6,681,195] in view of **Taki** [US 6,892,262].

Regarding claim 2, **Poland et al** fails to disclose the first communication port is capable of transferring data at a transfer rate substantially equal to at least one of 100, 200 and 400 megabits per second. However, **Poland et al** teaches that the image captured communication between the digital camera 140 and the portable computer processor 110 via an Ethernet connections (a 10Base-T Ethernet LAN with UDP or other protocol to provide a connection rate useful for rapidly downloading the digital images from the camera 140 to the processor 110, see Figs. 1 and 5, col. 6, lines 50-56. **Taki** suggests that a serial bus interface device such as IEEE 1394 serial bus having a high data transfer speed of 100 to 400 megabits per second and supports two kinds of transfer modes. The IEEE 1394 serial bus is connecting between a digital camera 102 and a personal computer 101 for transferring digital images there between, see Fig. 3,

Art Unit: 2636

abstract, col. 1, lines 6-20, col. 4, lines 42-57. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the IEEE 1394 serial bus interface of **Taki** for the Ethernet connection of **Poland et al** for providing a faster speed of transferring digital image data with identification information and reduce of losing data.

Regarding claim 3, all the claimed subject matters are discussed between **Poland et al** and **Taki** in respect to claims 1 and 2 above.

Regarding claim 4, all the claimed subject matters are discussed between **Poland et al** and **Taki** in respect to claims 1 and 2 above.

3. Claims 5-7, 10, 13-17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Poland et al** [US 6,681,195] in view of **Lock** [US 6,919,823].

Regarding claim 5, **Poland et al** fails to disclose the second digital video image collector to capture a second data file that is representative of a visual image of at least one feature of a second vehicle moving on a roadway and the second digital camera including a third communications port. However, **Poland et al** teaches of a single digital camera 140 being selectively positioned to capture images of a vehicle 134 traveling along a roadway, see Fig. 1, abstract, col. 6, lines 5-56. **Lock** suggests that a digital camera 18 captures images of a vehicle crossing a traffic lane A having sensor 22, and a second digital camera 19 captures images of a vehicle crossing a traffic lane B having

Art Unit: 2636

a sensor 23. The digital cameras 18 and 19 are connected to a digital computer 20 for processing and recording digital images, see Figs. 1 and 2, col. 3, lines 27-46 and col. 4, lines 25-30. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the two digital cameras of **Lock** with a single digital camera of **Poland et al** in order to capture more than vehicles traveling on different lanes or roads since the highway or mayor road having at least two lanes for improving of traffic congestions.

Regarding claim 6, all the claimed subject matters are discussed between **Poland et al** and **Lock** in respect to claims 1 and 5 above.

Regarding claim 7, all the claimed subject matters are discussed between **Poland et al** and **Lock** in respect to claim 6 above.

Regarding claim 10, all the claimed subject matters are discussed and combined between **Poland et al** and **Taki** and **Lock** in respect to claims 4 and 5 above.

Regarding claim 13, all the claimed subject matters are discussed and combined between **Poland et al** and **Taki** in respect to claims 2 and 12 above.

Regarding claim 14, all the claimed subject matters are discussed and combined between **Poland et al** and **Taki** in respect to claims 3 and 12 above.

Regarding claim 15, all the claimed subject matters are discussed and combined between **Poland et al** and **Taki** in respect to claims 3 and 12 above, and including a single house 310, see Fig. 5.

Regarding claim 16, all the claimed subject matters are discussed and combined between **Poland et al** and **Taki** in respect to claims 1 and 2 above.

Regarding claim 17, all the claimed subject matters are discussed and combined between **Poland et al** and **Taki** in respect to claim 16 above.

Regarding claim 20, all the claimed subject matters are discussed and combined between **Poland et al** and **Taki** and **Lock** in respect to claims 1 and 2 above.

4. Claims 8, 9, 18, 19, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Poland et al** and **Taki** and further in view of **Lock** [US 6,919,823].

Regarding claim 8, all the claimed subject matters are discussed and combined between **Poland et al** and **Taki** and **Lock** in respect to claims 2 and 5 above.

Regarding claim 9, all the claimed subject matters are discussed and combined between **Poland et al** and **Taki** and **Lock** in respect to claims 3 and 5 above.



Art Unit: 2636

Regarding claim 18, all the claimed subject matters are discussed and combined between **Poland et al** and **Taki and Lock** in respect to claims 5 and 12 above.

Regarding claim 19, all the claimed subject matters are discussed and combined between **Poland et al** and **Taki and Lock** in respect to claim 18 above.

Regarding claim 21, all the claimed subject matters are discussed and combined between **Poland et al** and **Taki and Lock** in respect to claims 5 and 20 above.

Regarding claim 22, all the claimed subject matters are discussed and combined between **Poland et al** and **Taki and Lock** in respect to claims 11 and 19 above.

### ***Conclusion***

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

**Dwyer et al** discloses a cashless toll collection system and method including a plurality of cameras for capturing images of vehicle's licenses when the vehicle does not equipped with a transponder. [US 6,140,941]

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from examiner should be directed to primary examiner **Van Trieu** whose telephone number

Art Unit: 2636

is (571) 272-2972. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 7:00 AM to 3:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. **Jeffery Hofsass** can be reached on (571) 272-2981.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Van Trieu', with a large, sweeping flourish extending to the right.

**Van Trieu**  
**Primary Examiner**  
**Date: 8/16/05**